

Remarks

Claims 1, 21, and 22 are amended. New claim 26 is added. These amendments add no new matter to the application. Support can be found for new claim 26 in original claim 1 plus page 4, lines 3-13.

The pending claims are 1-26.

Amendments to Specification

The Examiner stated that trademarks should be capitalized wherever they appear and should be accompanied by the generic terminology. Applicants have amended the specification accordingly.

More specifically, the specification is amended to capitalize the trademarks ALCONOX, CRIZAL, UNISLIDE, and SHARPIE. Applicants believe that these trademarks are adequately accompanied by the generic terminology. The specification indicates that ALCONOX is a soap, CRIZAL is an ophthalmic lens, UNISLIDE is an automatic dip coater, and SHARPIE is a marking pen.

Applicants believe that following trademarks are correctly capitalized and accompanied by the generic terminology: RBS-PF, HFE-7100, and HFE-7200. The specification indicates that RBS-PF is a detergent, HFE-7100 is a methyl perfluorobutyl ether, and HFE-7200 is an ethyl perfluorobutyl ether.

With the current amendments, Applicants believe that all the trademarks in the application are correctly presented.

Amendments to the Claims

Claims 21 and 22 are amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-23, and 25 were rejected as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,277,485 B1 issued to Invie et al. (hereinafter “Invie”) in view of either the applicant’s admitted prior art (hereinafter “AAPA”) or JP 2002-187740 A assigned to Nippon Sheet Glass (hereinafter “Nippon”) and in further view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0043142 A1 of Birch

(hereinafter “Birch”). Applicants submit that the pending claims are not obvious over this combination of references.

The Examiner correctly stated on page 5 of the Office Action that “[t]he combination of Invie et al. and either the AAPA or Nippon does not explicitly teach removing the antisoiling coating by treating the article with a plasma under vacuum conditions.” Further, the Examiner correctly stated on page 5 of the Office Action that “Birch et al. teaches a method of removing a hydrophobic coating from a glass substrate by plasma cleaning under vacuum conditions.”

However, the pending claims recite that a plasma under vacuum conditions is used to remove the previously applied antisoiling coating from the antireflective coating. The antireflective coating is a porous layer applied to the optical substrate. Birch provides no teaching or suggestion that the plasma treatment could be used on any surface other than glass. The surface of the antireflective coating is not the same as the surface of a glass substrate.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the obviousness rejection based on claim 1 as well as dependent claims 2, 4-8, 10-23, and 25.

Further, Birch provides no teaching or suggestion that the plasma treatment could be used to remove the previously applied antisoiling coating from an antireflective coating on a polymeric optical substrate as recited in new claim 26. A disclosure that plasma cleaning can be used on a glass substrate provides no teaching or suggestion that it would be suitable for removing a previously applied anti-soiling coating from such an article.

The Examiner rejected claims 4 and 23 as obvious over Invie, in view of AAPA, in further view of Birch, and in further view of Nippon. Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are not obvious over this combination of references.

Both Birch and Nippon disclose the use of plasma cleaning for a glass substrate. These references provide no teaching or suggestion that the plasma treatment could be used for any surface other than glass. That is, there is no teaching or suggestion to use a plasma treatment to remove a previously applied antisoiling coating from an antireflective coating (claim 1) or to remove a previously applied antisoiling coating from an antireflective coating on a polymeric optical substrate (claim 26). Disclosing that a glass substrate remains intact provides no teaching or suggestion that a different type of surface or a different type of material would remain intact (claim 4).

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the obviousness rejections of claims 4 and 23.

The Examiner rejected claim 3 as obvious over the combination of Invie in view of either AAPA or Nippon, in further view of Birch, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,474,648 issued to Patrick et al. (hereinafter “Patrick”). Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are not obvious over this combination of references.

Although Patrick may disclose one limitation of claim 3, this combination of references does not teach all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 26 as discussed above. That is, the combination of references provides no teaching or suggestion that a plasma treatment could be used to remove a coating layer from an antireflective coating (claim 1) or from an antireflective coating on a polymeric optical substrate (claim 26).

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claim 3.

The Examiner rejected claims 8 and 9 as obvious over Invie in view of either AAPA or Nippon, in further view of Birch, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 4,687,707 issued to Matsuo et al. (hereinafter “Matsuo”). Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are not obvious over this combination of references.

Although Matsuo may disclose one limitation of claims 8 or 9, this combination of references does not teach or suggest all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 26 for the same reasons discussed above. That is, the combination of references provides no teaching or suggestion that a plasma treatment could be used to remove a coating layer from an antireflective coating (claim 1) or from an antireflective coating on a polymeric optical substrate (claim 26).

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claims 8 and 9.

The Examiner rejected claim 24 as obvious over Invie et al., in view of either AAPA or Nippon, in further view of Birch, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,707,740 issued to Goodwin (hereinafter “Goodwin”). Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are not obvious over this combination of references.

Although Goodwin may disclose one limitation of claim 24, this combination of references does not teach or suggest all the limitations of independent claim 1 or 26 for the same reasons discussed above. That is, the combination of references provides no teaching or suggestion that a plasma treatment could be used to remove a coating layer from an antireflective coating (claim 1) or from an antireflective coating on a polymeric optical substrate (claim 26).

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of claim 24.

Applicants believe that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any additional fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3723. One copy of this sheet marked duplicate is also enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

August 2, 2004
Date

By: Jean A. Lown
Jean A. Lown, Reg. No.: 48,428
Telephone No.: (651) 733-3169

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel
3M Innovative Properties Company
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833